

Serial No.: 09/815,549  
Attorney Docket No.: AUS9-2000-0835-US1

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 12, 2004, claims 1, 9 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

Record is made of a telephonic interview between Applicants' attorney Edmond A. DeFrank and Examiner K. Lim on October 5, 2004. The Office Action of July 12, 2004, the cited references and the pending claims were briefly discussed. A proposed amendment modifying claims 1, 9 and 18 was discussed during the interview. Although no agreement was reached, the above amendments to the claims reflect the discussion between the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney during the interview.

Per the July 12, 2004 Office Action, claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over MacDoran et al.

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the MacDoran et al. reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed features in independent claims 1, 9 and 18. For example, MacDoran et al. fails to disclose or teach that the "actual location of the remote client" is "defined by a post office address." In addition, MacDoran et al. fails to disclose or teach "using the actual location of the remote client to automatically control and regulate different levels of access to the host server based on the predefined access parameters and if the post office address of the remote client matches a post office address on file at the host server associated with the particular Internet site that the remote client is attempting to access."

Although MacDoran et al. discloses authenticating a remote user based on the remote user's geodetic location, MacDoran et al. does not automatically control and regulate different levels of access to the host server if the post office address of the remote client matches a post office address associated with the Internet site that the remote client is attempting to access, like the Applicants' claimed invention.

Hence, since the cited reference does not disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' claimed invention, the reference cannot render the Applicants' invention


Serial No.: 09/815,549  
Attorney Docket No.: AUS9-2000-0835-US1

obvious. This failure of the cited references to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2143). As such, the Applicants' respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of the dependent claims, because they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, and they contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, these claims are also considered to be patentable (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly invite the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: October 12, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicants  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX